VIGMVND MRE P
N: 1
MVNVS DIVINVM

N: 3

N: 2

N: 5

N: 4

140 e 18
Haas

A

SERIES of DISSERTATIONS

ON SOME

ELEGANT and very VALUABLE

ANGLO-SAXON REMAINS.

I. A Gold Coin in the *Pembrochian* Cabinet, in a Letter to MARTIN FOLKES, Esq. late President of the Royal Society and of the Society of Antiquaries.

II. A Silver Coin of Mr. JOHN WHITE's, in a Letter to Mr. WHITE.

III. A Gold Coin of Mr. SIMPSON's of *Lincoln*, in a Letter to Mr. VERTUE.

IV. A Jewel in the *Bodleyan* Library.

V. Second Thoughts on Ld. PEMBROKE's Coin, in a Letter to Mr. AMES, Secretary to the Society of Antiquaries.

Also the COINS engraved on a COPPER-PLATE.

WITH

A PREFACE,

Wherein the Question, Whether the *Saxons* coined any Gold or not, is candidly debated with Mr. NORTH.

By SAMUEL PEGGE, A.M.

——*Ferimur per opàca locorum.*

VIRG. ÆN. ii. 725.

LONDON,
Printed for J. WHISTON and B. WHITE in *Fleetstreet*.
MDCCLVI.
(Price 2s. 6d.)

PREFACE

TO THE

READER.

THE following Diſſertations being in themſelves entirely independent of every other Deſign I may have formed in my own Breaſt, and at the ſame time having a mutual and not inobſervable Connection one with another, it has been thought proper to bring them together, and to offer them to the Publick. And this I was the rather induced to do, by reaſon that, thro' the humane Diſpoſition of the Gentlemen concerned, they have been already peruſed by ſome of our Antiquaries; and that, at the Requeſt of others, I have been every now and then called upon to give Copies; a Taſk which, though I have hitherto never declined, yet I ſhould now be glad to be diſcharged from. And whereas the Purport of the *firſt* and *third* Piece evidently tends to eſtabliſh a Fact of great Importance to the curious Collectors of our *Engliſh* Antiquities, to wit, *that our Saxon Anceſtors had amongſt them ſome coined Gold*; and this Point, it ſeems, is not ſo thoroughly reliſhed by the *Literati*, as to be thought every way clear and indubitable, but on the contrary to be liable to ſome Objections, I was willing to appeal to the World upon that Head, and to ſubmit my Obſervations on this Subject to a more general Examination.

The Occaſion of writing the ſeveral Pieces is ſufficiently opened in the reſpective Papers, and there will be no Need for me to repete any thing concerning that matter here; but then, ſince the Fact above-mentioned *of the Saxons coining Gold*, as aſſerted in the *firſt* and *third* Letter, has been publicly oppoſed by a Perſon of ſome Note in the College of Antiquaries, it will be neceſſary to take ſome Notice of what that Gentleman has been pleaſed to alledge.

The Rev. Mr. *George North*, at the End of his Remarks on Mr. *Clarke's* Conjectures concerning a ſuppoſed Coin of *Richard* I. has printed an *epiſtolary Diſſertation*, read to the Society of Antiquaries, on ſome *ſuppoſed Saxon Gold Coins*. What Reception his Diſſertation met with from the Gentlemen of the Society I cannot tell, but I am perſuaded that upon a mature Diſcuſſion of the Reaſons there offered, others will incline to believe that the Gold Pennies in Queſtion may poſſibly be *Saxon* ſtill.

'Tis preſumed that by the Words, *The Notion of a late happy Diſcovery of Gold Saxon Coins, has ſo much engaged the Attention of the Curious, and ſo much Pains have been taken in attempting a ſatisfactory Explication of the Legends on them*, &c. Mr. *North* had an Eye to the *firſt* and *third* of the enſuing Papers, as well as to a Gold Coin of Dr. *Ducarel's* which he mentions in his laſt Page: And therefore as I am ſo directly intereſted in the Event of this Diſpute, wherein he is pleaſed to diſſent from me ſo totally, his Candor, I hope, will indulge me a few Words in my own Defence.

In the firſt place, then, Mr. *North* offers a general Argument, againſt theſe two Pieces being *Saxon*, from the

the Singularity of their Types, for, ſays he, *The Coins of all Nations in Gold and Silver bear a Reſemblance to each other*; and, *however the Gold and Silver Coins may differ in Size, Weight, or Value, yet there is a conſtant Sameneſs of Manner in denoting and expreſſing to whom they belong.* But this Argument proves a great deal too much; for there is not this Analogy between the Coins either of the *Saxons* or the *Engliſh*. Our firſt *Engliſh* Gold Coins differed vaſtly in their Type from the Silver ones of the Time; and amongſt the *Saxons*, the Copper *Sticas* varied as much from the Silver Pennies, of thoſe Days; even of the ſame Kingdom. Were the Gold Coins therefore not *Engliſh*? were the *Sticas* therefore not *Saxon*? The intelligent Reader will eaſily diſcover how inconcluſive this ſort of Reaſoning is. Now as the Coins varied in one reſpect, they might vary alſo in *another*, and ſo as to that Particular here mentioned, of *expreſſing the Name of the Perſon to whom they belonged*, 'tis poſſible that an Omiſſion of that ſort might be peculiar to the golden Specie; this, I ſay, is poſſible; but there is no occaſion to have Recourſe to a poſſible Suppoſition, becauſe if the Perſon to whom a Piece belonged was denoted by any other Method *equally certain*, the Omiſſion of the Name *in that Caſe* might be eaſily diſpenſed with. Now I apprehend, that the Appropriation of the Piece was ſufficiently provided for by the *Mintmaſter's* putting his Name; for as theſe Maſters were then publickly known, and were withal Perſons of good Account, it was always notorious by whoſe Authority the Coin was ſtruck, and conſequently to what Prince or Prelate it belonged. Thus for Example, in Sir *Andrew Fountaine's* ix^th^ Tab. you

have a Coin inſcribed on the Obverſe, ✠ ≤VVEFNERD MONETA, and on the Reverſe, :SYVEFNERD MONEGH, in the Area DR̄VR̄ ĒiT̄S; from whence it is very clear that the Coin, though the Name of the Proprietor be not mentioned, either belonged to the then ſitting Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* or the Abbot of *St. Auguſtine*, the former of whom had two Mints, and the latter one, at *Dorovernia* or *Canterbury*. The Head upon the Obverſe muſt neceſſarily repreſent one of theſe Prelates; and this, I think, is as certain as if the Name of either of theſe great Eccleſiaſtics had been expreſſed in alphabetical Letters. I may add, that it was *then* very aſſuredly known, whether it was a Coin of the Archbiſhop or of the Abbot, becauſe every one knew, or might know if they pleaſed, whoſe Servant *Swefnerd* was, to wit, whether he belonged to the Archbiſhop or to the Abbot.

So again, as to the next Coin in that Plate, the Obverſe is inſcribed, ✠ LVNINE MONETA, and the Reverſe has in the Area DOROBERNIA EIVITAS; upon which I argue in like manner, that here the Prelate's Name, by whoſe Authority the Piece was coined, is not expreſſed in Letters, but yet every one could know at the Time whoſe Coin it was, from the Maſter's Name and the Place of Coinage.

I ſhall give a third Inſtance, and let that ſuffice, from the *Sancti Petri Moneta* in the ſame Plate, none of which exhibit to us the Names of the Archbiſhops of *York*, and yet ſince the Name of the City of *York* appears upon ſome of them, and the Name of the *Maſters* upon others, they are groundedly eſteemed to be Coins of the

the Archbiſhops of that Province, and no doubt but at the Time it was ſufficiently known to what Prelate each Penny appertained (1).

The Caſe is abundantly clear as to the Earl of *Pembroke's* Coin, and I think not leſs ſo in relation to Mr. *Simpſon's*; for admitting LETO to have been a Workman of King *Sihtriſc's* in the *Northumbrian* Kingdom, the Subjects of that State, on the Sight of any Pennies with his Name, would immediately receive them as the legitimate Coin of their King.

But what becomes of our Author's Obſervation all this while, that there is *a conſtant Sameneſs of Manner in denoting and expreſſing to whom they belong*? 'Tis ſaid without Grounds, *that the Coins of all Nations in Gold and Silver bear a Reſemblance to each other*, as I have ſhewn; and then, as to the *Sameneſs of Manner in denoting and expreſſing to whom they belong*, there is no foundation for an Objection againſt *Saxon Gold Coins* from this Topic, becauſe, as we ſee, the Silver Coins do not always expreſs the Perſon to whom they belong, that is, they do not always expreſs him in *Letters*, which is what Mr. *North's* Words muſt be interpreted to mean.

As to this Argument then from Analogy, which is thought to lie ſo ſtrong againſt me, I would obſerve, that ſo far from oppreſſing me, it really militates very ſignally on my Side of the Queſtion; for whereas I

(1) See alſo *S. Martin's* Penny in Lord *Pembroke's* Cabinet, Part iv. *Tab.* 2. and *St. Edmund's* Money in Sir *Andr. Fountaine*, Tab. vi. and above all, the Coin marked *Eotberehtus* in Sir *Andrew's* viii^th *Table*, for the Coin belongs to *Egbert* of *Weſſex*, and the Name on the Reverſe is the *Mintmaſter's*, and not the King's.

contend

contend that the Coin inſcribed VIGMVND appertains to *Wulſtan* I. Archbiſhop of *York* (1), the three prelatical Coins of the *Pembrochian* Cabinet, Part iv. *Tab.* 2. do all of them very remarkably reſemble it, as does alſo the Penny of *Ceolnoth* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* in Sir *Andrew Fountaine's* third Table; and certainly if a prelatical Coin be like the reſt of the ſame Series, it will amount to a ſtrong Preſumption, that it is truly appropriated; wherefore I muſt inſiſt, that this Gold Coin of my Lord *Pembroke's* is formed altogether after the Manner and Taſte of the *Saxon* prelatical Specie. And this Obſervation I deſire may extend to Mr. *Simpſon's* Coin, which not only anſwers to Weight, but the Buſt upon it is alſo ſufficiently like King *Sihtric*, and no one, methinks, that knows any thing of the *Anglo-Saxon* Coins, will object to the Appearance of a *Monogram* on the Reverſe.

It ſeems to me, that Gentlemen, in judging of theſe Matters, do not allow enough to the State and Condition of the *Mintmaſters*; the Nature of whoſe Office and Employment likewiſe in theſe early Times ought to be taken into Conſideration. The *Maſters* were not *Earls*, nor perhaps of that high Rank, as Mr. *Thwaites*, and others, are ready at every Turn to ſuppoſe them; but nevertheleſs they were People of ſome Conſequence; and the very Nature of their Office, conſidering that there were various Mints then going on in one Kingdom, and even many in one Town, as there were no leſs than ſeven in the City of *Canterbury*, made it neceſſary for their Names to appear in one Part or other of the Coin;

(1) See the firſt Diſſertation.

becauſe

becauſe in caſe of any Irregularity, either as to Weight or the Purity of the Metal, a Complaint could not be made againſt the proper Perſon, unleſs it were known who the Minter was. And for this Reaſon, as I apprehend, the *Moneyers* were obliged to put their Names *ſomewhere*, and, as far as I remember, there are very few *Saxon* Coins, if you except the *Sancti Petri Moneta* and the reſt of that Claſs, that want the Name of the Maſter, I dare ſay there are not above one or two (1). This now may be thought another valid Reaſon, along with that above given (to wit, that the Maſter once known, the King or Prelate would alſo be known) why it might happen that the *Maſter's* Name ſhould occur in a Coin, even without the King's or the Prelate's.

But I come now to what Mr. *North* calls a *cloſe* and *deciſive* Argument. It runs thus; *The only Piece of Gold we meet with in the Saxon Hiſtorians is the Mancus or* Mancuſe, *if, therefore, it ſhall be proved, that theſe new diſcovered Pieces cannot be the Coin ſo called, the Queſtion is decided.* But the Conſequence is here denied; and upon this Foundation; to wit, that moſt Nations had *Denominations* in their Accounts different from any Pieces current among them, and that the *Mancus* or *Mark*, it is preſumed, was of that Kind. The *Saxons* reckoned by the *Pound*, the *Shilling*, and the *Mancus* (2); but it does not appear they had any current Pieces of the Value of a

(1) *N. B.* The Name EOTBEREHTVS in the Coin marked *Eotberehtus* in Sir *Andr. Fountaine's* viii^th^ *Table*, is the Name of the Mintmaſter, and not of the King, as was ſaid above.

(2) *Nicholſon's* Hiſt. Libr. p. 44. Edit. 1714. where ſee the reſt, both of the coined Money and their Denominations. Note, They had both *Silver* and *Gold* Marks, the firſt being four Pennies and the latter thirty.

Shilling,

Shilling, or of a Pound; and therefore one may reaſonably ſuppoſe, until we have proved to the contrary, they had no coined Piece of the Value of the *Mancus*, but that it was only a Name in Accompts, juſt as the *Engliſh Mark* was; the Caſe, I preſume, was the ſame in reſpect to the *Thrimſa*. Allowing, therefore, that Mr. *North* ſhould have eſtabliſhed this Point never ſo clearly, *viz.* that the Coins, under Conſideration, are not *Mancus's*, it will not ſerve his Purpoſe, ſince the *Saxons* might have Gold Coin amongſt them, though not of the Weight or Value of the *Mancus*. Whereupon I infer, that all that follows in Mr. *North's* Diſſertation, only proves that Mr. *Simpſon's*, and Dr. *Ducarel's* Pennies are not *Mancus's*, which nobody ever ſuppoſed they were; but nevertheleſs they may be *Saxon* Gold Pennies, and if, upon this Gentleman's Principles, Gold in the *Saxon* Times was in Proportion to Silver, as Nine to One, the Value of each would be Nine-pence. I know not whether it be worth while to mention it, but I have myſelf a Gold Penny, which by the Aſpect ſhould be *Saxon*, and weighs twenty Grains, which tallies very well with the Weight both of the *Doctor's*, and Mr. *Simpſon's* Piece, whereof the former raiſes Nineteen Grains and a Half, and the other Nineteen; whereupon I cannot avoid remarking, as to Lord *Pembroke's* Coin, that whether it anſwers to Weight, or not, and whether I have adjudged it in the Diſſertation that follows to the right Owner or no, that is, though it ſhould ſtill remain the Property of *Wigmund* of *Mercia*, it will nevertheleſs be a *Saxon*, and continue to be a Proof that our Anceſtors of that Nation coined ſome Gold.

But

But as to my Sentiments concerning the State of the Gold Specie in theſe remote Times, theſe I have declared in the following Diſſertations, where it is ſaid, "Tho' "the *Saxons* here in *England* probably had not much "coined Gold current amongſt them, their Payments "in that Metal, when large, being otherwiſe regulated, "yet this hinders not, but a ſingle Gold Piece ſtruck "by way of *Medal*, may have come down to us." And again, "It begins now to appear to me.... that the "*Saxons* actually ſtruck ſome Gold, though perhaps not "much. Time, I am greatly in hopes, will clear this "Point more fully." This Opinion I ſee no Cauſe at preſent to relinquiſh; for though the Pieces in Queſtion do not prove to be the *Mantus*, they may nevertheleſs, as I have already aſſerted, be *Saxon* Coins. Here then I might diſmiſs Mr. *North's* Appendix, being directly concerned with it no further than this; however, I ſhall go ſo far out of my Way, as to ſay, that his Poſitions cannot be admitted. The firſt is, that the Weight of the *Saxon* Penny was Twenty-two Grains and an half; this now is generally ſpoken, but cannot be true, for the *Saxon* Coins varied, and many that I have weighed actually are a full Penny-weight and more; ſeveral of them Twenty-five Grains. Upon which I make no other Reflection at this Time, though it is a Subject that leads to ſome very important Concluſions, but that the *Tower Weight*, as it is called, could not prevail when the Coins were ſo heavy; and conſequently that this Author expreſſes himſelf too generally, when he ſays, *The Weight of the Saxon Penny ... appears to be the ſame as of our moſt ancient Engliſh Money*; and that it cannot

be ſaid *univerſally*, as he ſeems to ſpeak, that the *Saxon* Penny was *the twentieth Part of the Ounce of the Pound Tower, which was equal to Eleven Ounces Five Penny-weights Troy*; for the *Saxon* Penny at certain Times was more than that, and therefore though this might be the State of Affairs in the later Reigns, it was not ſo in the more early ones. In ſhort, Mr. *North*, when he ſpeaks ſo looſely, ſo largely, ſo generally, runs the *Tower Weight* too high in Time, or, in other Words, makes it too old. The next Poſition is, that Gold was to Silver as Nine to One, but this is upon a Suppoſition, that the Proportion was the ſame before as after the *Norman* Conqueſt, as appears from his Quotations; whereas it is far more conſonant to Reaſon to ſuppoſe, that it varied at different Times; that it was *greater* or *leſs*, no matter which, in the Year 800, than it was A. D. 1066. and that in all Probability, during the Continuance of the *Heptarchy*, it was different in the different Kingdoms. The *Sticas*, we know, were peculiar to the *Northumbrian* Kingdom, and what if the Gold Coins were ſo too? There are ſome Grounds at preſent to think ſo, and this perhaps may be the Reaſon that they are ſo very ſcarce with us. Who then ſhall preſume to ſay, what the Proportion was between Gold and Silver in that *Northern* Kingdom? Or with what Shew of Reaſon can it be eſtimated by the Proportion obſervable in the Time of our *Henry* the Firſt, as Mr. *North* does? For my part, I dare not launch into theſe deep and obſcure Matters.

And therefore to conclude, I will not pretend to ſay, nor even to hope, that the Matters contained in theſe Diſſertations, are in every Part ſo firmly eſtabliſhed, as

to

to ſatisfy all Readers; no; they are many of them of very remote Antiquity, where the Memoirs are but few, inſomuch that too often,

——*Nox atra cavâ circumvolat umbrâ*;

for which Reaſon, theſe Conjectures, I hope, will be entitled to a competent Degree of Candour. Gentlemen, I am ſenſible, will judge differently, ſome perhaps thinking they have Reaſon to object againſt one Point, and ſome againſt another. But ſo far, however, I think, I may venture to aſſert, to wit, That enough is here ſaid in the two Diſſertations on the Gold Coins, as likewiſe in this Preface, to cauſe Gentlemen to be alert, and to prevent them, when they are making their Collections, from rejecting a Piece merely from the Singularity of the Type, or becauſe it does not exactly quadrate with the preſent received Notions of Things; and much leſs on account of the *Metal*, ſince as to the Point, *whether the Saxons coined any Gold Money*, though it may be deemed by ſome to be ſtill a diſputable Queſtion, others will think the Affirmative to be much the moſt likely to be true. The Negative, ſo far as I can diſcover, has nothing on its ſide, but a preconceived Opinion or Prejudice, namely, the Declarations of ſome former Antiquaries grounded upon the Non-appearance of Gold Coins in their Time; whereas the Affirmative, at the ſame time that it is ſo deſireable, is alſo ſupported with certain very plauſible Pretences.

A SERIES of DISSERTATIONS ON SOME ELEGANT and very VALUABLE ANGLO-SAXON REMAINS.

I.

A brief Diſſertation on a moſt rare Gold Piece in the Pembrochian *Cabinet*, Part iv. Tab. 23. *wherein it is proved to be a real* Anglo-Saxon, *and probably a Medal of* Wulſtan, *Archbiſhop of* York.

In a LETTER to MARTIN FOLKES, Eſq.

SIR,

AFTER I had the Pleaſure of inſpecting along with you that curious Gold Coin in the late Earl of *Pembroke's* Collection, ſuppoſed to belong *Wigmund* King of *Mercia*, and ſome Doubts were raiſed concerning it, I held it adviſeable at better Leiſure to take it into more mature Conſideration: And having now formed what I think a true, at leaſt a ſettled Judgment upon it, I beg Leave to ſubmit my Sentiments to your candid Diſquiſition, and by your means to communicate them, if you think proper, to the learned Society of Antiquaries, over which you ſo worthily preſide.

The Coin is undoubtedly exquiſite both as to the Type and Size, the Metal and Owner of it; in moſt of which

which Particulars it is indeed an *Unic*, greatly enriching that noble Collection of which it is a Part.

Concerning the *Owner* there is nevertheleſs ſome Cauſe of Doubt. In my Lord's own Plate it is ſaid to be the Coin of *Vigmund* King of *Mercia* along with *Wiglaf* A. D. 830. but this Opinion I propoſe, in the Sequel, to call into Queſtion, and after that to diſcover the true and rightful Proprietor of it.

Now in the firſt place I find nothing that leads to the Opinion of its appertaining to that *Mercian*, but on the contrary every thing againſt it.

I make the firſt Objection to the Form of the Letters, particularly the G, which in the *Mercian* Specie is always either ꝺ, 6, or ȝ. See Sir *Andrew Fountaine's* Tables in *Wiglaf*, *Cynethrith*, and *Coenulf*.

The ſecond lies againſt the Head, which is a full Face, with a peculiar Ornament upon it, both which are entirely repugnant to the Repreſentations given us of the *Mercian* Princes, either in Sir *Andrew Fountaine's* Tables or in this Collection.

My next Objection is to the Style, VIGMVND MREP which they interpret *Vigmund Merciorum Rex*, for I muſt think the Ligature MR to be Part of ſome *one* Word; and conſequently that the M, ſo tied to the R, cannot be ſeparated from it, ſo as to ſtand for *Merciorum*, as Gentlemen ſuppoſe, which would be highly unnatural. Neither can I diſcern in this Legend the Word REX, it being evidently REP.

The laſt and greateſt Exception is, that upon the ſtricteſt Enquiry I cannot find there ever was any ſuch King of *Mercia* as *Wigmund*. For though both *Bromp-*

ton and *Higden* inform us (1), that *Wiglaf* had a Son of that Name, yet he never was King, either in Conjunction with his Father or ſingly by himſelf; all the Authors that mention him agreeing, that *Berthulf* immediately ſucceeded *Wiglaf*.

And for theſe Reaſons I eſteem it abſolutely neceſſary to ſeek out for ſome other Proprietor of this Coin, whoſe Claim may better conſiſt with Appearances. This Proprietor, as I ſhall now ſhew, was probably no other than *Wulſtan* the Firſt, the ſixteenth Archbiſhop of *York*.

Firſt, I conclude it to be a prelatical Coin, becauſe I obſerve it in every reſpect to reſemble thoſe Pieces of this Claſs engraved in this Collection, *Part* iv. *Tab.* 2. which are all full faced, with a like Ornament or *Mitre* on the Head. See alſo the Heads of the Prelates in Sir *Andrew Fountaine*, Tab. iii. and ix.

Vigmund or *Wigmund* I judge to be the Name of the *Mintmaſter*, nothing being more common than to ſee the *Maſter's* Name placed on the Obverſe of the Coins, Sir *Andrew Fountaine*, Tab. i. *Ælfred*, N° 11. and Tab. ix. *Numiſmata incerta*, N° 5, 6. *Le Blanc*, *Traité des Monnoyes de France*, p. 57. and the *Saxon* Gold Penny found at *Hull* (2), eſpecially where there is no Room for his Name on the Reverſe, as happens to be the Caſe here, and on the Coin laſt cited (3). MR is therefore the

(1) *Brompton*, inter X Scriptores, col. 778. *Higden*, p. 254. Edit. *Gale*. See alſo the *Polychronicon*, Fol. ccxxiv. b.

(2) Gentleman's Magazine 1747, p. 526 and 557.

(3) See alſo the *Pembrochian* Collection, *Part* iv. *Tab.* 2. the third Penny there.

Abbreviation

Abbreviation of *Monetarius*, and the whole of the Legend I interpret, VIGMVND *Moneta*Rius EP*iſcopi*.

Quære then, who this *Vigmund* was, and when he lived? For if that Point can be made out, we ſhall be enabled to conjecture with a tolerable Degree of Probability, whoſe Effigies it is that the Coin bears. Now there is a *Maſter* of this Name on two Coins of *Anlaf* the *Daniſh* King of *Northumberland*, Sir *Andrew Fountaine*, Tab. x. which I believe to be the ſame Perſon; conſequently this Piece muſt have been ſtruck in the *Northumbrian* Kingdom and at *York*, and exhibits to us the Image of ſome Archbiſhop of that Province cotemporary with that royal *Dane*; and, as there is good Grounds for believing, of Archbiſhop *Wulſtan*, the ſixteenth Prelate, who ſat in that See from A. D. 941. to A. D. 955. and is known to have taken part with the *Danes* in that Country againſt his Liege Sovereigns King *Edmund* and King *Edred* (1), and with *Anlaf* conſequently, whoſe Reign coincides with that Interval of Time. Whereupon it may be proper to remark, that the Workmen of the royal Mints were often employed by the Prelates of thoſe Times; thus *Æthelulf*, who wrought for *Plegmund* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, was a Maſter of King *Ælfred's*, and of *Burgred* King of *Mercia*; and *Diala*, who ſerved Archbiſhop *Ceolnoth*, was likewiſe the Workman, perhaps in a different Part of his Life, of *Coenulf* King of *Mercia*.

I eſteem it no Objection to our Conjecture that Archbiſhop *Wulſtan* is here only ſtyled *Epiſcopus*, for I find *that* very commonly done. See Mr. *Drake's Eboracum*,

(1) Mr. *Drake's Eboracum*, p. 409.

p. 400. The Laws of King *Æthelſtan*, Cap. xiv. Dr. *Hickes's* famous *Epiſtolary Diſſertation*, p. 73. *Eddius*, Vita *Wilfridi*, Edit. *Gale*. Archbiſhop *Uſher's* Antiq. Brit. Eccl. p. 52, &c (1).

Nor is it any Objection that the Piece is Gold; for though the *Saxons* here in *England* probably had not much coined Gold current amongſt them, their Payments in that Metal, when large, being otherwiſe regulated, yet this hinders not, but a ſingle Gold Piece, ſtruck by way of *Medal*, may have come down to us (2). And if we can be allowed, Sir, to conſider this Piece *as a Medal*, it might poſſibly be coined on Occaſion of the Peace ſtruck up between King *Edmund* and King *Anlaf*, A. D. 942. by the Mediation of our Prelate and of *Odo* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*; but this is offered as a mere Conjecture. However, the Reverſe, MVNVS DIVINVM, round a Wreath, or Crown, may properly enough denote the Reſtoration of Peace, the Gift of Heaven, in Alluſion to *Luke* ii. 14. *Glory to God in the higheſt, and on Earth Peace, Good-will towards Men.*

I ſhall only add for a Concluſion, that the above Appropriation of this Coin to the *Anglo-Saxon* Series, receives great Confirmation and Support from the celebrated *Sol d'Or* of *Ludovicus Pius*, of which Monſ. *Le Blanc*, p. 99, has given us both the Hiſtory and the

(1) *Cavendiſh*, Life of Card. *Wolſey*, p. 48 and 155. *Godwyn's* Hiſt. of *Hen.* VIII, p. 71. *Brooke's* Cat. of Honour, p. 159. So *Speed* of the Pope, p. 1008. and the Proteſtants generally call the Pope only *Biſhop of Rome*; ſo the Popes often ſtyle themſelves. See alſo *Sparrow's* Collection, p. 1 and 4. And the Oath of Allegiance.

(2) This Point, whether the *Saxons* coined *ſome* Gold, is ſecure, whether this Piece be of *Mercia* or of *Northumberland*.

Type. The Reverse has a like Cross within a Wreath, or Crown, with the same Inscription, *Munus Divinum*, which I think never appears on any Silver Coin. *Lewis* died A. D. 840, and his *Sol* weighed 132 Grains, which, if one may judge by the Size of our Type, might probably prove to be the Weight of this Piece, were it tried; but the Superintendant of Lord *Pembroke's* Tables has unfortunately omitted the Weight of this admirable and truly valuable *Anglo-Saxon* Remain.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

Godmersham, June 20, 1751.

SAMUEL PEGGE.

To

II.

To Mr. JOHN WHITE.

SIR,

THE Day after I ſent away my laſt, I found a little Leiſure to conſider your curious *Anglo-Saxon* Penny, of which you was pleaſed to ſend me a Type, and I here ſend you, with my Compliments, the Reſult of a cloſe and very careful Inſpection. [See Plate, N° 2.]

Whereupon I have to remark, firſt, that the Name *pulſton*, or *Wulſton*, on the Obverſe, cannot be the Mint-maſter, as was the Caſe in the Gold Coin of Archbiſhop *Wulſtan*, on which I formerly diſſertated, becauſe the Maſter's Name occurs on the Reverſe.

It muſt, therefore, ſecondly, be the Name of the Prelate for whom, or by whoſe Authority, the Piece was coined; for *Wulſton* or *Wulſtan* not being the Chriſtian Name of any King of *England*, and the Device, moreover, not agreeing with thoſe of any of our regal Coins, it ought to be referred, unqueſtionably, at leaſt in my Judgment, to that very imperfect Series, which I would call the *Prelatical Series*.

And then, thirdly, conſidering the Form of the Reverſe, and the Manner of expreſſing the Legend there, we ought, I think, by all means, to refer it to the Cloſe of the Reign of *Ethelred* II, the Father of *Edmond Ironſide*, who died *Ann.* 1016, and whoſe Coins preſent us with the like Legends, and the ſame Stamp exactly, on that Side. We muſt, conſequently, try what Prelate of that Time it will beſt ſuit.

Now we have no leſs than three *Wulſtons* on Record, who may put in their reſpective Claims. The firſt is *Wulſtan* I, the ſixteenth Archbiſhop of *York*, who died A. D. 955, according to Mr. *Drake's Eboracum*. This is he whoſe Gold Coin I before endeavoured to illuſtrate, but cannot be the Prelate to whom this Piece belongs, becauſe he went off the Stage too early, *Ethelred* not acceding to the Throne till A. D. 978, and it being in his Reign that this Type and Legends of this Form firſt came into Uſe.

The ſecond is *Wulſtan* III, Biſhop of *Worceſter*, who was conſecrated A. D. 1062, towards the End of the *Confeſſor's* Reign, and died A. D. 1095, in the Time of *William Rufus*. But this cannot be the Perſon, becauſe he is as much too late as the other was too early.

The third is *Wulſtan* II, the Twenty-firſt Archbiſhop of *York*, who ſucceeded to both the Sees of *York* and *Worceſter*, A. D. 1002, and died A. D. 1023. Theſe Dates beſt agree with the Form and Faſhion of this Coin; and as *Ethelred* II. acceded A. D. 978, and died 1016, his Death happened but ſeven Years before that Prelate's; and moreover, we ſhall find that the Type of the Obverſe, at leaſt as I interpret it, accords perfectly well with the Promotions of this great Eccleſiaſtic; but of that by and by.

And thus having found the Perſon to whom this Coin belongs, and he being both Archbiſhop of *York* and Biſhop of *Worceſter*, there will naturally ariſe a fourth Queſtion, to wit, whether the Piece was ſtruck for him as Archbiſhop of *York*, and conſequently was minted in the Dioceſe of *York*, or as Biſhop of *Worceſter*, and

therefore

therefore in ſome Town of that Juriſdiction. I incline to believe the former, having found no Proof as yet, that the Biſhops of *Worceſter*, as ſuch, ever coined any Money, whereas we are ſure the Archbiſhops of *York* did.

But Quære, fifthly, where then this curious Penny was coined? the Reverſe is ✠ EANA ON LVD. from whence it is very obvious to imagine it was ſtruck at *Ludlow* in *Shropſhire*; but that cannot well be, ſince *Ludlow* is neither in the Dioceſe of *York* nor *Worceſter*, but in *Hereford*, where you will find no Biſhop of this Appellation. Whereupon I would obſerve, that there is no Place of this Orthography in the Dioceſe of *Worceſter*; which amounts to a further Proof, that *Wulſtan* coined it not as Biſhop of *Worceſter*. But then, was there any Place ſo ſpelt in the Dioceſe of *York*? I anſwer, I think there was, and I pitch upon the Town of *Leedes* in *Yorkſhire*, anciently written *Loid* or *Luyt*. [See Mr. *Thoreſby's* Pref. to his *Ducatus Leod.* p. viii.] For the Vowels are ſo eaſily changed, that *Loidis*, as *Leedes* is called in venerable *Bede*, might by others as readily be written *Lydis* or *Ludis*. And I myſelf have a Coin of *Ethelred* II, with a Reverſe minutely in the ſame Form, and coined at the ſame Place, as I conjecture, for the Inſcription runs, ✠ ÆLFRIL ПO LVD. And this, methinks, adds a mighty Confirmation to the Obſervation above, as to the Age of this Piece, ſince it ſhews ſo clearly, that Money of this Type was actually coined for the Crown, at *Leedes*, in the Reign of King *Ethelred* II.

Whereupon I would obſerve, that whereas that worthy good Man and diligent Antiquary, the late Mr. *Ralph Thoreſby*, who being a Native of *Leedes*, was very ſolicitous

ſolicitous to eſtabliſh a Mint at that Place, comments upon one of his own *Sticæ* thus:

"EDELRED. REX. *Rev.* LEOFDES. *Moneta.* ſup-
"poſing the F redundant, or deſigned for E, wanting
"only the *Lineola* at the Bottom (an eaſy Error in the
"bungling Minters of thoſe Ages) and it makes LEODES.
"*Leedes* was, without Controverſy, a Place much more
"eminent during the *Heptarchy* than many Places that
"occur upon their Monies, witneſs *Bede*, the *venerable*
"Hiſtorian, who lived in this very Century, and writes
"it likewiſe with an O." [*Thoreſby's Muſæum*, p. 341.]

Whereas, I ſay, Mr. *Thoreſby* was ſo deſirous of finding a Mint at *Leedes*, we can now furniſh him with one upon very good Grounds, which I doubt were wanting before; for as to the *Stica* in Queſtion and his Conjecture upon it, he in the firſt Place miſreads the Name, which on the Coin is ΓEOFDEL. [See the Type in *Camden*, Tab. v. N° 13. of the Copper *Sticas*,] or LEOFDEG, which probably was intended for *Leofreg* (1) or *Leofrig*, a Name not uncommon amongſt the *Saxons*. [See the *Saxon* Chronicle *paſſim*, and in particular the Name of a Minter of *Ethelred* II. See Sir *Andrew Fountaine's* firſt *Table*; you have the L in this Form Γ, on the two *Sticas* of *Ethelhelm*.] And then, what is worſe, he takes the Name of the Mint-maſter for the Name of the Place, interpreting M. *Moneta*, whereas it rather ſignifies *Monetarius*.

One Word now upon the Device on the Obverſe, and then I have done. One of the Figures is apparently a

(1) Dr. *Wotton* (that is, Mr. *Thwaites*, for Mr. *Thoreſby* miſtakes the Perſon) read it GEOFREG. See the Notes on that Table in *Camden*.

Woman,

Woman, as is clear from her Breasts, and I take it for granted, it was intended to represent the *Virgin Mary*. The other Figure, which is a Man, is in no Posture of Adoration, as one would expect from the received Notions of those Times, and moreover is placed on the Right Hand, consequently must be at least equal, or perhaps superior to her in the present Case. From whence I conceive, that *Wulstan* being both Archbishop of *York* and Bishop of *Worcester*, and the former of these Cathedrals being dedicated to St. *Peter*, and the other to St. *Mary*; these two Figures mean to represent St. *Peter* and St. *Mary*; and in this Case *York*, being the principal See, St. *Peter* would necessarily have the Right Hand. The Device, thus interpreted, affords us this Sense, *Wulstan Bishop of St. Peter's and St. Mary's*, and at the same Time appropriates the Coin, irrefragably, to *Wulstan* II, the Twenty-first Archbishop of *York*, as was asserted above, since there was no other *Wulstan* but him that enjoyed both the Sees.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient,

Whittington, Sept. 8, 1755.

SAMUEL PEGGE.

To

III.

To Mr. George Vertue.

SIR,

THE Gold Coin, of which you was pleaſed to ſend me a Drawing (1), is very curious in Regard both of the Metal and the Type. It is undoubtedly an *Anglo-Saxon*, of the *Northumbrian* Kingdom, being ſtruck at *York*, in the Beginning of the tenth Century; and perhaps is a Coin, but this I ſpeak with Diffidence, of the *Daniſh* King *Sihtric*. Theſe Points I ſhall endeavour to eſtabliſh and illuſtrate, as follows:

The Inſcription on the Head Side is LETO MON. that is *Leto Monetarius*; for it is very cuſtomary to have the *Mint-Maſter's* Name on an Obverſe. Of this you will find many Examples in Monſ. *Le Blanc's Traité des Monnoyes de France*, p. 57, *ſeq.* But this Point I have fully clearly in a Diſſertation on the famous Gold Piece of my Lord *Pembroke's*, Part iv. Tab. 23. and therefore need ſay no more here than only to obſerve, that ſometimes the King's or the Prelate's Name is expreſſed in the Reverſe, and ſometimes not, as in this Caſe. And that, where it is not, it muſt needs be, generally ſpeaking, exceeding difficult, and ſometimes abſolutely impracticable, to ſay, whoſe the Piece is.

(1) See Plate, Numb. 3. *N. B.* This curious Gold Penny is the Property, or lately was ſo, of Mr. *Thomas Simpſon* of *Lincoln*. See *Gent. Magaz.* 1747, p. 526 and 557.

The Letters in the Cypher on the Reverſe ⅀Ɛ, are only EiE, for the Twiſt in the Middle is nothing but an Ornament or Ligature to tye the E and I together. Theſe Letters, Sir, I interpret, CIvitas Eboraci; for I have ſeen the Place of Coinage very often expreſſed in ſuch *Monograms*; witneſs that incomparable Coin of King *Alfred* with his Head, in Sir *Andrew Fountaine's* firſt Table, and Monſ. *Le Blanc*, p. 88, *et alibi*. And indeed where the *Maſter's* Name is on the Obverſe, as here, the Place of Coinage generally occupies the Reverſe in ſome Shape or other. Sir *Andrew Fountaine*, Tab. ix. *Numiſmata ineerta*, N° 6. *Le Blanc*, p. 57.

This Cypher, together with the Place where the Piece was found, to wit, at *Hull* in the County of *York*, induces me to refer it to the *Northumbrian* Kingdom, where only, ſo far as yet appears, the *Anglo-Saxons* coined Gold.

And I refer it to the beginning of the tenth Century, becauſe I think it might be about that Time, if one may judge from the Gold Coin of Archbiſhop *Wulſtan*, that the *Saxons* began to ſtamp Gold. The Weight, methinks, which is nineteen Grains, agrees perfectly with this Period, for the Silver Money of King *Edmund* and King *Edred*, in Mr. *Thoreſby's* Muſæum, and the *Cotton* Library (1), run thereabouts; and I muſt believe that the Gold Money was adjuſted exactly to the Silver,

(1) I was favoured with the Weights of Mr. *Thoreſby's* Coins by his Son; and thoſe in the *Cotton* Library I weighed myſelf, with the Permiſſion of the late Mr. *Caſley*.

as to Weight, whatever Difference there was, as to the Value of the two Metals (1).

I ſhould imagine, laſtly, that about this Time, the *Mint-maſters* began in *England* to deſiſt from putting their own Names only, without the King's, on the Specie; for I do not recollect any Example of it later than the Middle of this Century. If this be ſo, then I think this may poſſibly be a Coin of *Sihtric*, King of *Northumberland*, who began his Reign, according to Mr. *Drake*, A. D. 914, and the Drawing certainly agrees ſufficiently with the Head of *Sihtric* in Sir *Andrew Fountaine's Tab.* ix.

I have been the more exact in the Conſideration of this Piece, becauſe it begins now to appear to me, from this Penny, and my Lord *Pembroke's* Piece above-mentioned, that the *Saxons* actually ſtruck ſome Gold, tho' perhaps not much. Time, I am greatly in hopes, will clear this Point more fully. In the mean while,

I am, Sir,

Your moſt obedient,

Godmerſham, July 31, 1751.

SAMUEL PEGGE.

(1) Dr. *Ducarel's* Gold Penny weighs Nineteen Grains and a Half, mine Twenty Grains.

IV. *A Diſſer-*

IV.

A Diſſertation on an ancient Jewel of the Anglo-Saxons *, now in the* Bodleyan Library.

THERE is a well known and curious Piece of Gold now in the *Bodleyan* Library, of which I propoſe here to take ſome Notice, though it be not properly a Coin. It has been no leſs than four Times engraved, firſt by Dr. *Plot*, in his *Natural Hiſtory of Oxfordſhire*; then in *Camden's Britannia*; after that by Sir *Andrew Fountaine*, in the *Epiſtolary Diſſertation* prefixed to his *Tables*; and laſtly by Mr. *Wiſe*, in the xvii^th^ *Table* of his *Catalogue*; and all the Gentlemen concerned; to whom I may add Mr. *Thwaites* in his Notes on the *Anglo-Saxon* Coins, have reſpectively given their Opinion of it, but are ſo diſcordant amongſt themſelves, that there is indeed great Room and great Occaſion for a Moderator to compoſe Differences between them, and, if one may be ſo happy, to give the true Explication of it. The Method I ſhall take will be in the firſt Place to give you the ſeveral Authors Words; then to add ſome Remarks upon them; and laſtly, but with all due Deference to the great Names herein to be produced, to ſubjoin my own Opinion.

Dr. PLOT, in his *Nat. Hiſt. of Oxfordſhire*, p. 352.

" Before they [the Kings of *England*] *touch* for this Diſtemper [the *King's Evil*] they have always Prayers read ſuitable to the *Occaſion*, both which, when performed, the King forthwith beſtows on every *Patient* a

* See Plate, N° 4.

Piece of *Angel-Gold* purpoſely coined, and put upon a *White Ribbon* to be hung about the Neck; which as long as worn preſerves the Virtue of the *Touch*. . . . . However it be, that this was the Cuſtom *ab initio* I take to be plain from that Piece of *Gold* of King *Edward* the *Confeſſor*, Tab. xvi. Fig. 5. found in *St. Giles's* Field in the Suburbs of *Oxon*, having the *initial Letters* of his Name over the hinder Part of his Head, and two ſmall *Holes* through it, as if deſigned to be hung on a *Ribbon* for the Purpoſe above-mentioned, the *Holes* being ſtrengthened with *Gold Wire* faſtened round them, and to the Piece itſelf, much after the Faſhion of the *Eye* of a Man's Doublet, as exactly deſcribed in the Figure, *ut ſupra*; which Piece was lent me by that courteous Gentleman Sir *John Holeman*, Bart. in whoſe Poſſeſſion it now remains at his Houſe near *Northampton*."

Mr. OBADIAH WALKER, in *Camden's Britannia*, Tab. iv. N° 40.

"The fortieth is taken out of Dr. *Plot's* Hiſtory of *Oxfordſhire*; it was found in digging the Works (1) at *Oxford*, and is, or not long ſince was, in the Poſſeſſion of Sir *John Holman*. It is ſuppoſed to be the Gold given by St. *Edward the Confeſſor* at his curing the *Scrophulæ*, or the *King's Evil*. It is worth noting, that it hath upon it the Figure of a Woman veiled (not unlike a Nun) whether of the bleſſed Virgin, or ſome other holy Woman, I cannot determine. But it ſeems much more proper for that Function, than that now uſed of an Angel; which was taken from the French."

(1) In *St. Giles's* Field. Dr. *Plot*.

Mr.

Mr. THORESBY in *Camden*, ibidem.

"That *Edward the Confeſſor* was the firſt of our Kings who cured the *Struma*, is acknowledged by all, and that it was called the *King's Evil* upon that Account is probable enough: But that he and the ſucceeding Kings gave Pieces of Gold in this Form, may, I think, be juſtly ſcrupled, and can never be proved from E C, the ſuppoſed Initials of his Name, who is never ſtyled *Confeſſor* upon any Moneys or Medals of undoubted Antiquity. And if Gold had been coined and diſtributed upon this, or any other Occaſion, in thoſe Ages, a greater Number of them, no doubt, would have been found in the Cabinets of the Curious, as well as their current Moneys; whereas, nothing of that Metal appears till *Edward* the Third's Time; and that, perhaps, no other, than the current Silver Money of each Prince, except gilded for Diſtinction. Such an one, with a Hole for the Ribbon to be hung about the Neck, was amongſt the Curioſities in the old Lord *Fairfax's* Muſæum, and is yet preſerved in this. It has the full Face (as he is repreſented upon his Great Seal in *Speed's* Hiſtory) with the arched Crown, and may poſſibly be one of the ſame numerical Pieces given upon that Occaſion. As for the Curioſity deſcribed by the ingenious Dr. *Plot*, in his Hiſtory of *Oxfordſhire*, and from him tranſmitted to Number *Forty* in this Table, I look upon it as a Sort of Amulet (for which thoſe darker ſuperſtitious Ages had an extraordinary Veneration) like that noble one of King *Alfred*, deſcribed by the learned Dr. *Hickes* (1); and do

(1) In his *Theſaurus Ling. vet. Septentr.* p. 142.

conclude,

conclude, with Dr. *Wotton*, that thoſe Pieces inſcribed *St. Edmond*, were of the like Nature."

Sir ANDREW FOUNTAINE, Diſſert. Epiſt. ad Comit. *Pembrochiæ* præfix. Tab. Nummorum *Anglo-Sax.* &c.

"At vero mihi haud diffitendum eſt, ne unum quidem [nummum aureum] aut a me unquam fuiſſe viſum, aut inter legendum mihi occurriſſe, niſi in Diſſertatione illa *Walkeriana* et Hiſtoria Naturali comitatus *Oxonienſis* a Doctore *Plot* conſcripta. Hic quidem ſcriptor, eumque ſecutus *Walkerus*, nummum 40^m^ in tabula octava (quam videre eſt in prædicta editione Britanniæ *Camdenianæ*) autumat eſſe *Saxonicum*, et qualem ad curandam Scrophulam *Edvardus* cognomento *Confeſſor* hominibus morbo illo laborantibus elargiri ſolitus eſt. Sed ratiociniis adeo infirmis innixa eſt hæc opinio, ut in tabulis noſtris monetæ *Saxonicæ* nummus iſte nullum obtinuerit locum. Veruntamen iconem ejus infra apponere viſum eſt, ut inde judices, Hon. Comes, quam valido argumento contendat *Walkerus* nummum hominibus ſcrophulæ affectis elargiendum, monachæ quam Angeli (uti nunc dierum in more poſitum eſt) imagine rectius eſſe ſignandum."

Mr. THWAITES.

"In the 161^ſt^ Page of Sir *Andrew Fountaine's Epiſtolary Diſſertation*, a Coin (or Piece of Money) repreſents, if I am not miſtaken, the Head of *Jeſus Chriſt*, with theſe Letters, C. A. ⪦. Ω. that is, *Chriſtus Alpha et Omega*; *Chriſt*, *Alpha and Omega*, the Beginning and Ending, or firſt and laſt. This Head is adorned with a triple Crown. The little Character ⪦ (&, *and*) is to be ſeen now in ancient Coins,

ſtruck in the ſame Manner. It is taken from the *Anglo-Saxon* ⁊ or ꝯ (&, *or* and.)"

Mr. WISE, Numiſm. *Bodl.* Catalog. p. 232.

"Supereſt dicendus nummus aureus, ſi nummum vocare fas ſit, olim prope Oxoniam repertus, et a celeberrimo Joanne Radcliffe, M. D. ſcriniis Bodleianis donatus. Sane non diſſimilis eſt iſtis, quos Bracteatos et Cavos vocant Antiquarii Septentrionales, ſcilicet tam incuſus quam excuſus. Hunc primus vulgavit Cl. *Rob. Plot*, M. D. in *Hiſt. Naturali Comitatus Oxonienſis*, illumque autumavit ex iis eſſe, quos infirmis Scrophula laborantibus dedit Edwardus Confeſſor. Quam etiam opinionem calculis ſuis probarunt alii eruditi: immo Cl. Edw. Thwaites literas A et Ω in epigraphe, ſi qua ſit, videre voluit. Vid. Not. in Num. Saxon. Sæculum proculdubio olet, quin et opus forte, Saxonicum; at an unquam monetæ inſervierit, merito dubitatur. Quandoquidem Saxonibus in nummis propriis rarus aut nullus, uti diximus, auri fuit uſus; a quo vero, in cimeliis diverſi generis fabricandis, eos neutiquam alienos fuiſſe abunde conſtat. Quare ipſe in alium uſum iſtud elaborari cenſeo, ad codicis, puta, aliuſve ſupellectilis, ornamentum; cujus etiam exteriori tegumento affixum fuiſſe, me maxime perſuaſum habeo."

So far the Gentlemen Commentators: Now as to Dr. *Plot's* and Mr. *Walker's* Notion, of this being one of thoſe Pieces diſtributed by *Edward the Confeſſor* amongſt the Patients touched by him for the *King's Evil*, the later Antiquaries, Sir *Andrew Fountaine*, Mr. *Thoreſby*, and Mr. *Wiſe*, all agree to reject it, and, I think, very juſtly.

juſtly. In the firſt Place, Dr. *Plot* builds his Opinion upon the C, which he thought he diſcerned upon it, and which he imagined might denote *Confeſſor*; but that Letter is not a *C* but a *G*. Secondly, I eſteem this Piece of Gold to be older than that Prince. Thirdly, I do not take it to be a Coin. Fourthly, The Head does not repreſent a Woman veiled, conſequently neither the bleſſed Virgin, nor any other holy Woman, as *Walker* thought, but a Perſon of a higher Order, as will be ſeen below: To all which you may add, fifthly, the plauſible Objections raiſed by Mr. *Thoreſby*.

Mr. *Thoreſby* very rightly judges it to be an *Amulet*, but he has contributed little to the Explanation of it, ſince he adds nothing either concerning the Effigies or the Letters upon it, but leaves us ſtill entirely in the Dark as to them.

Sir *Andrew*, in Effect, ſays little upon it, contenting himſelf with alledging it to be no Coin, and expoſing Mr. *Walker's*, and Dr. *Plot's* Notion, of its being *a Touch Piece*.

Mr. *Thwaites*, who follows next, has come neareſt the Truth; but as on one hand he takes it for a Coin, which it is not, ſo on the other, he ſtill perſiſts in the old Track of taking the *G* for a *C*, and likewiſe has overlooked two other Letters. Moreover, his Interpretation has been ſo coldly received, ſo ſlighted by Mr. *Wiſe*, who ſeems entirely to diſſent from him, and even to doubt whether there be any Inſcription or not, that it may be thought neceſſary, to do Juſtice to Mr. *Thwaites* in certain Particulars.

Mr.

Mr. *Wiſe* very rightly holds it to be a *Jewel*, and not a Coin; but then, I think, he miſtakes its Uſe, and even doubts, as I ſaid, whether there be any Legend upon it; which I cannot but admire, ſince that is ſo evident in his own Type.

What I propoſe, therefore, to do in the laſt Place, in regard to this Diſſonance of Opinions, is, firſt, to diſcover and explain the Letters. Secondly, to ſhew whoſe the Head is. Thirdly, to add a Word of the Age of the Jewel. And fourthly, of the Uſe for which it was originally deſigned.

Firſt then, this Jewel is chaſed and repaired; for that Side which is placed for the Reverſe in Mr. *Wiſe's* Type (which I make Uſe of here, as eſteeming it to be the moſt accurate) is the *Intaglia*, or concave Side, and the Obverſe is the Convex. But the Workman very thoughtleſly (a Fault too frequent in thoſe rude and early Times) wrought the Letters of his Draught or Pattern the right End upwards on the Concave Side, by which Means all of them but one, namely, the G, are inverted on the other. The Margin, which conſiſts only of Ornaments, ſeems to be entirely emboſſed, or the Work of the Chiſſel, there being no Appearance of it on the other Side. The Letters, then, on the Convex Side, where they are the faireſt, are EGOVSʊ, all which, except the G, being, as I ſaid, inverted, when they are made to ſtand upright, are EGOΛƧΩ, which I interpret *Ego Alpha et Omega*, the Λ wanting the croſs Stroke, as is very common on the Coins, and the reverſed S (Ƨ) being an uſual Abbreviation of *et*. Mr. *Thwaites* calls this *the little Character* ≤, but I do not know why,

ſince it is of the Size of the Letters. This Character he deduces from the *Anglo-Saxon* ꝟ or ȝ, which is certainly very unnatural, if it is to ſtand that Way he gives it; but if it be reverſed, as is alledged above, then it may poſſibly be that *Anglo-Saxon* Character rounded at the Corners, or rather that other Mark E, which he gives us, Page 182, ſo rounded; and it is certain, that upon the *Engliſh* Coins, both Gold and Silver, from *Edward* III. to *Edward* VI. incluſive, the ⁊ or *et* generally ſtands that Way. Mr. *Thwaites* alſo overlooks two of the Letters, the firſt and third, and takes the G for a C; but it is evidently a G in Mr. *Wiſe's* Plate, and the other Letters, E, G, O, are very conſpicuous upon the Jewel on the Obverſe or convex Side; and I cannot but wonder he ſhould miſs them; and much more that Mr. *Wiſe* ſhould diſpute the Exiſtence both of them and the reſt of the Letters, which I think muſt be undoubted to every body elſe. Theſe, now, are all the Letters and Characters I can perceive, the Strokes or right Lines, that precede the E, being intended for another Purpoſe, as will appear hereafter.

The Head, therefore, in the ſecond Place, is not an *Angel's*, or the *Bleſſed Virgin's*, or other *holy Woman's*, as has been ſuppoſed, but our bleſſed Saviour's. The Legend plainly alludes to *Rev.* i. 8. *Ego ſum α et ω* (1); and you may obſerve the *Croſs* placed before his Face, and *Rays of Glory* (which at firſt Sight ſome might take

(1) I think it very probable, that the Word *ſum* was wanting in that Copy of the *Latin* Vulgate which the *Deſigner* of this Jewel made Uſe of. But at preſent I have no Opportunity of examining how the ſeveral Copies of that Verſion ſtand, in Relation to this Text.

for

for Letters) iſſuing from the Dreſs or Ornament of his Head; for what Mr. *Thwaites* above calls a *triple Crown*, is nothing elſe but an antique Head-dreſs, ſomething like what we have on the Coins of *Burgred* King of *Mercia*, in whoſe Territory the Jewel was found. See Sir *Andr. Fountaine's* Tab. iii. *Burgred*, N° 17—23.

I would willingly, therefore, thirdly, refer the Piece to the *Mercian* Kingdom, the G being of a Form ſometimes uſed in that Country, [See the foregoing Diſſertation on the Coin of Archbiſhop *Wulſtan*] and to the Reign of King *Burgred*, who was living when King *Ælfred* came to the Crown, and flouriſhed in the Middle of the Ninth Century. But if any Gentleman, on Account of the Inſcription A?Ω, would chuſe to place it an Hundred Years later, when the Alluſion to that apocalyptical Deſcription of our Saviour was much in Vogue, namely, in the Reign of *Ethelred* II, as appears from his Money in Sir *Andr. Fountaine's* firſt Plate, I will not greatly conteſt it with him. In either Caſe, the Jewel will be older than *Edward* the *Confeſſor*, and can have no Relation to him, or his pretended Cures. However, it ſhould be remembered, on the other Side, that in the *Franco-Gallic* Series, the A and Ω appears ſooner than the Time of *Kenred* King of *Northumberland* (1). It is obſervable, that there are certain Holes in it for a Silken String or ſmall Ribban to paſs through; and therefore I think it highly probable, in the laſt Place, that it was intended to be worn about the Neck, either by way of Ornament, or perhaps as an *Amulet*, or Charm, according to the Conjecture of Mr. *Thoreſby*.

(1) *Le Blanc*, p. 14.

And this, I think, much more likely than the Notion of Mr. *Wiſe* (who fancies it might be intended for the Boſs or Ornament of a Book, or ſome other Piece of houſhold Furniture) by Reaſon that the ſaid Holes are placed near together, and not oppoſite to one another in different Parts of the Margin or Border, which ſurely they would have been, had the Jewel been intended to have been faſtened to any other Subſtance.

Quære, Whether this be not the oldeſt Piece of *chaſed* Work at this Day any where extant.

V.

Second Thoughts on Lord PEMBROKE's *Coin*;

In a LETTER to Mr. JOSEPH AMES.

SIR,

YOU remember that in the Year 1751 I wrote a Letter to Mr. *Folkes*, concerning a curious Gold Penny of Lord *Pembroke's*, which I perceive has been perused by many others of my Brother Antiquaries, as well as yourself. But since then, and indeed since the preceding Dissertations, with the Preface prefixed, were dispatched to *London* for the Press, I have had the Pleasure of inspecting, by the Favour of our common Friend, Mr. *White*, a *Couple of Sticas*, which have occasioned me to alter my Sentiments on that Coin. This, Sir, I am never ashamed to do upon valid and sufficient Reasons; and what the Reasons are that have induced me to do it in this Case, I here beg Leave to declare in what follows. And this Method I take of giving the World my *second Thoughts*, rather than to suppress or interpolate the Letter; because, as I observed, it has been seen by so many; and that though I shall now appropriate the Coin to a different Prelate, the Letter, in the most material Parts, will not be affected, and wherever it is, I propose to specify below.

Now, Sir, one of Mr. *White's Sticas* is in most exquisite Preservation; and this still remains in the Custody of that Gentleman, who has permitted it to be engraved *.

* See the Plate, N° 5.

The

The other, which now by his Bounty enobles my ſlender Cabinet, is in good Order in every other Reſpect but the Prelate's *Title*, which unhappily is but too much defaced.

The Inſcription of the firſt, which ſingly is ſufficient for our preſent Purpoſe, is, ✠ VIGMVND ARE-P; Reverſe, ✠ LoENRED. The Legend on the other Coin is the ſame on both Sides, only, as I ſaid, the E-P are ſomewhat obliterated; for that the third Letter in the Style is a E, and not an E, will appear evidently to any one that compares it with the two E's on the Reverſe.

You will be ſenſible, Sir, that ARC-P can ſtand for nothing but *Archiepiſcopus*, of which Word thoſe Letters are a natural Abbreviation; eſpecially if it be conſidered, that the third Letter with the ſhort Line or Dot after it, and placed juſt in the Middle of it, was intended both for a E and for an E, as was common in theſe Times. And whereas we now, according to the Truth of the Etymology, do inſert an H and an I in this Latin Name, that was not the Cuſtom anciently; for you have upon the Coins AREEPIS for *Archiepiſcopus*. See Sir *Andr. Fountaine's* Tab. iii. *Ceolnoth*, N° 2. As in the *Saxon Chronicle*, anceb. for the Engliſh Word, *Archbiſhop*.

Theſe *Sticas*, then, muſt belong to *Wigmund*, the twelfth Archbiſhop of *York*, who ſat in that See from the Year 831 to A. D. 854. For though both *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter* (1), and *William* of *Malmſbury* (2), agree in calling him *Wimund*, yet I preſume it is by Accom-

(1) *Matth. Weſtmon.* Ann. 831. 854.
(2) *Gul. Malmſb.* p. 269.

modation

modation to the Pronunciation of their own Times, and that otherwiſe the true and ancient Orthography was *Wigmund*, or *Vigmund*, a Name not infrequent among the *Saxons* (3). Whereupon I would obſerve, that *Malmſbury*, in another Place, to wit, p. 291. writes the Name *Guimund*, ſtill more conformably to the *Norman* Manner, for that *Guimund*, and *Wimund*, and *Vigmund*, are the ſame Name, there remains no Doubt with me. However, for the Sake of others, I will proceed ſo far as to remark, that the *Mercian* King, *Wiglaf*, a Cotemporary of our Prelate's, and whoſe Name is ſo given both on the Coins (4), and in the *Saxon Chronicle* (5), as likewiſe in *Florence* of *Worceſter* (6), and *Ralph Higden* (7), is called by *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter* (8), and *William* of *Malmſbury* (9), and *Henry* of *Huntingdon* (10), *Wilaf*; inſomuch that it ſeems to have been the conſtant Method of theſe later Hiſtorians to ſoften theſe old Names by leaving out the rough Letter G. But the Name is clearly written *Vigmund*, on two *Sticas* in Sir *Andrew Fountaine's* x^th^ Table, and there given to *Anlaf*, the *Daniſh* King of *Northumberland*. For, Sir, I muſt be of Opinion, that thoſe two *Sticas* do both of them appertain to this Prelate, the Obverſes there being put for the

(3) *Wilkins's* Councils, Tom. i. p. 179. 175. 167, 168.
(4) Sir *A. Fountaine*, Tab. ix.
(5) *Chron. Sax.* p. 71.
(6) *Florentius Vigorn. paſſim.*
(7) *Polychronicon*, p. 254. Edit. *Gale.*
(8) *Matth. Weſtm.* p. 154. 157.
(9) *Gul. Malmſ.* p. 345.
(10) *Hen. Huntingdon*, p. 346.

Reverſes,

Reverſes, and, *vice verſa*, and *Hunlaf*, the Name of the Mint-maſter, being taken for the Name of the Prince. All this, Sir, I take to be very plain from the Legend of the firſt of theſe Coins, ✠ VIGMVNDΛR, where the two laſt Letters (the laſt Stroke of A coaleſcing with the upright Stroke of the R) ſtand for *Archiepiſcopus*; for if this firſt of thoſe two *Sticas* be rightly interpreted, as I dare ſay you will think it is, there will be no Doubt of the other; and then all the Difference between theſe, and our *Sticas*, will be, that they were ſtruck by two different Maſters.

Suppoſing then, that theſe four *Sticas*, or, if you will, our two *Sticas* only, are the Property of Archbiſhop *Wigmund*, is it not probable that Lord *Pembroke's* Gold Penny belongs to the ſame Prelate? The Letters are certainly ſufficiently ſimilar. And more than this, have we not ſome Reaſon to ſuſpect, that the Letters on my *Lord's* Coin, MREP, have been miſread for *A*RE-P? But this, Sir, I can only put as a Query, of which I muſt leave the Deciſion to thoſe who hereafter may have an Opportunity of viewing the Coin more accurately.

And now, Sir, let us ſee what Effect this new Appropriation of my *Lord's* Coin will have upon the Letter formerly written about it to Mr. *Folkes*. And this truly in the main will be very little or nothing. For firſt, the Coin ſtill remains abjudicated from the *Mercian* Prince. Secondly, it ſtill proves to be a Coin of the *Northumbrian* Kingdom, as alſo of the *Prelatical* Series. Thirdly, it was ſtill coined probably in Imitation of the *Sol d'Or* of *Ludovicus Pius*, who was Cotemporary with Archbiſhop

biſhop *Wigmund*, though not on that Occaſion conjectured in the Letter. And fourthly, and laſtly, it ſtill continues to be a ſtrong Proof, that the *Anglo-Saxons* had amongſt them ſome coined Gold. But in relation to this Particular, it may be proper for me to note, that whereas I have inſinuated, in the *third* of the foregoing Diſſertations, that it might be in the *Tenth* Century that the *Saxons* began to ſtamp Gold, it appears now that they began in the *Ninth*.

In the Letter to Mr. *Folkes*, I have alſo ſaid, "that my "*Lord's* Coin was exquiſite both as to the Type and "Size, the Metal and Owner of it: In moſt of which "Particulars it is indeed an *Unic*;" and this was truly the Caſe at that Time; but it ſeems it is no longer ſuch either in reſpect of the Metal or the Owner, ſince Mr. *Simpſon's* Gold Penny, and, in my Opinion, others, will rank with it in Point of Metal; and then as to the Owner, it has been found now, at length, that we have *two*, if not *four Sticas* of the ſame Prelate. But, how widely do the *Sticas* and the Gold Penny differ? which ſhews what little Foundation there is for our Friend Mr. *North's* Remark, "That the Coins of all Nations "in Gold and Silver bear a Reſemblance to each other." For certainly there is as much Reaſon for Gold and Copper to be alike, as Gold and Silver, and yet nothing can well be more diſſimilar, as to the Type in general, than my *Lord's* Piece and the *Sticas*.

I will only trouble you with one Particular more; I have ſaid, in the foregoing Preface, that there are very few *Saxon* Coins that want the Name of the Mint-maſter; but if *Wigmund* be the Name of the Prelate, as is here

fuppoſed, this Coin of my *Lord's* will be another Inſtance. But then, Sir, the Obſervation will not be greatly invalidated by that, ſince there are ſo few Examples of it, even with this Coin of my *Lord's* included.

I am, Sir,

Your moſt obedient,

Humble Servant,

Whittington, Oct. 15, 1755.

SAMUEL PEGGE.

FINIS.

Lately publiſhed, by J. WHISTON *and* B. WHITE,
In one Volume, Royal Quarto,
(Price Eighteen Shillings neatly bound)

I. TABLES of Ancient COINS, WEIGHTS, and MEASURES, explained and exemplified in ſeveral Diſſertations. By JOHN ARBUTHNOT, M. D. Fellow of the Royal Society and of the College of Phyſicians. To which is added, An APPENDIX, containing Obſervations on Dr. Arbuthnot's Diſſertations on Coins, Weights, and Meaſures. By BENJAMIN LANGWITH, D. D.

II. A DISSERTATION upon ORIUNA, ſaid to be *Empreſs*, or *Queen* of *England*, the ſuppoſed Wife of CARAUSIUS, Monarch and Emperor of *Britain*, who reigned in the Time of *Diocletian*, the great Perſecutor of *Chriſtians*; whom he was at War with for many Years, until received as Collegue with him in the *Roman Empire*. Illuſtrated with the *Coin* of ORIUNA, and ſeveral others moſt remarkable of CARAUSIUS, hitherto not made public; this Coin of her's being lately ſent to *France* to his Moſt Chriſtian Majeſty. Price 2 s. 6 d. ſew'd.